27/8/86 at 12^00

Unanswered Questions Raised by the Holocaust.

Intro: Ladies + Gentlemen: My topic is: ___

- As you already know, Frank Chalk + I teach a course on Genocide. We take two semester and are not able to deal with all the materials.
- You have watched Shoa for over 9 hours and ~~are~~ you have come to this series of talks because you felt that you were left with many un-answered questions.
- And now I stand here in front of you for only 20 minutes (those are my orders!) I hope that you do not expect any answers from me, because I have decided that in 20 minutes I can only deal with ~~a few~~ questions.
  In any case, the answers to most of these questions remain to be discovered. ~~in the~~
- Keeping my talk short is not the main reason for choosing to deal with unanswered questions. There is a more serious reason: If, in the future, we are going to be able to prevent ~~and~~ or to stop genocidal killing, we must first find out and understand in what social situations + under what conditions such killings occur. This is another way of saying that we shall need much more scholarly research that will produce answers to the unanswered questions - only some of which I can present to-day.
- Allow me to insert a plug here for the MIGS that Frank Chalk + I have just set up. We hope to develop the Montreal resources to become the center for genocide research in Canada.

More during discussion period.

Why did the Final Solution have priority over the war effort?
Did the Germans really believe that they could do both?
Perhaps that is not the right question. But some German authors have suggested that Hitler lost the war because it did not have top priority.

- The question is important because the same ordering of priorities has occurred in other states
  eg: Turkey + the Berlin-Baghdad RR
  eg: Russia + the pre-war purges
- Thus it seems that ideological imperatives had priority no matter what the cost. But Why?
  We don't really know. It needs much more research.
  This is what we might refer to as ideological genocides.

Why were there such great differences in victimization? of the Jews in the various occupied + allied countries? Several scholars have tackled this question, but no convincing + generally accepted answers have emerged. This is an important question because it may produce answer that could help to prevent future genocides.

- Let me just indicate how difficult these matters are: Bulgaria, Denmark, + Italy were at the low end of victimization - but what do they have in common?
- The search for answers becomes even more complicated when we let our own biases intrude into the research. The scholars who have tried to deal with this question have all omitted Spain + Portugal from consideration. (even Martin Gilbert) Both ~~had~~ had fascist regimes + the memories of the Spanish civil war were all-too-fresh - which may explain why they were ignored; but it does not explain why they were relatively friendly to Jewish refugees.

Why did the "righteous gentiles" help?

Yehuda Bauer has suggested that they did not do it because they liked the Jews, but that they shared the prevailing anti-semitic attitudes of their society. If true, why did they help?

The answer will probably show that there were many different motivations, but the research on this question remains to be done. We can get some hints from the memoirs + autobiographies of survivors that help to formulate questions.

like: religious institutions looking for converts
individuals looking for financial gain
a way of opposing Germany
helping a personal friend

Why did Germany admit its guilt? No previous
× {nation state / perpetrator} had ever admitted its guilt.
There seems to be no quick answers, but thinking about this question leads to several other questions:

- Which Germany? Under Hitler there was only one. After Hitler there are two, but only one admitted its guilt. Why?
- And why did they decide to pay restitution money to survivors?
- Now that we have had a precedent, why do some nation states follow Germany's example + others do not?

yes:		no:	
West Germany	1945	Turkey	Austria
Russia	1956	Burundi	
China	1984	Paraguay	
Japan	1984	Indonesia - East Timor	
		Ethiopia	
		etc.	

Manipulated information so successfully that it became known as a victim instead of an enthusiastic perpetrator.

× Dichotomy of empires + nation states.

Other questions:

- Are Lerner/Cohn + Fein correct in suggesting that genocide legitimates a new regime?

- If so, how are new regimes legitimated? And when does that process require a genocide?

- Perhaps it is not the state directly, but the ideology that requires legitimation? i.e: that it looses credibility if it does nothing about those it excludes.